

Date: Thu, 13 May 93 02:29:32 PDT
From: Ham-Policy Mailing List and Newsgroup <ham-policy@ucsd.edu>
Errors-To: Ham-Policy-Errors@UCSD.Edu
Reply-To: Ham-Policy@UCSD.Edu
Precedence: Bulk
Subject: Ham-Policy Digest V93 #140
To: Ham-Policy

Ham-Policy Digest Thu, 13 May 93 Volume 93 : Issue 140

Today's Topics:

 Amateur Secondary Use of 219-220 MHz
 More on no-code (2 msgs)
 Should auto mechanics learn how to shoe horses? (4 msgs)
 sick of it all (2 msgs)
 What we all agree on - THEORY TESTS THAT MEAN SOMETHING (2 msgs)

Send Replies or notes for publication to: <Ham-Policy@UCSD.Edu>
Send subscription requests to: <Ham-Policy-REQUEST@UCSD.Edu>
Problems you can't solve otherwise to brian@ucsd.edu.

Archives of past issues of the Ham-Policy Digest are available
(by FTP only) from UCSD.Edu in directory "mailarchives/ham-policy".

We trust that readers are intelligent enough to realize that all text
herein consists of personal comments and does not represent the official
policies or positions of any party. Your mileage may vary. So there.

Date: Tue, 11 May 93 22:46:05 CDT
From: mvb.saic.com!unogate!news.service.uci.edu!usc!howland.reston.ans.net!
zaphod.mps.ohio-state.edu!menudo.uh.edu!jpunix!unkaphaed!amanda!
robert@network.UCSD.EDU
Subject: Amateur Secondary Use of 219-220 MHz
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

The FCC issued a Notice of Proposed Rule Making (RM-7747) to create a new
shared band for amateurs at 219-220 MHz. The Commission proposes to
allocate this band to amateurs on a secondary basis for amateur auxiliary
station (point-to-point) packet backbone networks and other amateur
point-to-point fixed communications. The FCC proposals are in response to
a petition for rule making filed by the ARRL in 1991. A detailed report
on the League's petition appeared in QST for August, 1991 (page 58).

"The proposed allocation would alleviate" the FCC says "frequency
congestion that amateurs are experiencing in certain areas of the country
in the 222-225 MHz band and would facilitate establishment of regional

and nationwide backbone networks for amateur packet communications."

The FCC also proposes requirements to insure that secondary use of this band by amateurs does not interfere with primary and existing secondary licensees in this and adjacent bands, and proposes measures for coordinating amateur operations with the primary user of the band, Automated Maritime Telecommunications Systems (AMTS). The FCC agreed that power limits suggested by the ARRL - 25W PEP for Novices, 50W PEP for all others - are appropriate and reasonable, although the Commission does not propose Novice operating privileges at 219-220 MHz.

The deadline for comments is 15 June 1993, and for reply comments 15 July 1993.

[reprinted from WORLD RADIO - June, 1993]

Date: Wed, 12 May 93 17:47:42 GMT
From: swrinde!sdd.hp.com!cs.utexas.edu!usc!howland.reston.ans.net!agate!
headwall.Stanford.EDU!nntp.Stanford.EDU!umunhum!paulf@network.UCSD.EDU
Subject: More on no-code
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In article <C6vxDo.JJG@ucdavis.edu> ez006683@othello.ucdavis.edu (Daniel D. Todd) writes:

>: 1. Because, empirically, they don't. We already know that.
> ^^^^^^^^^^^^^ and YOU are unbiased?

I think that if you are of the opinion that the loads on the CW and Phone spectra in the amateur HF allocations are not comparable, not many would agree with you, including the FCC, which has the empirical studies to back up the opinion.

>: 2. You're proposing the change, so it's *your* burden of proof.
> Oh good now we're getting close! What would you like to see proven,
> specifically? I have never, to the best of my knowledge said it would be
> a good thing to completely eliminate code from licensing in the US.

You need to demonstrate that any change that you do in fact propose will not increase band loading beyond capacity. That's what the current system has achieved.

> I have pointed out how ridiculous many of your arguments are.

This is only your second posting in response to one of mine. I've posted dozens of times on this issue, over the past nine years. Would you mind being more specific as to which of my arguments are "ridiculous"?

>To claim you want to keep the bands from becoming crowded you are only
> showing that you wish to remain an elitist.

Hmm, about a two on the JSMADS. ;-)

Seriously, limiting the number of spectrum users is no more elitist than
limiting the number of people in a theatre due to the fire hazard.

>Had you said that you don't want to see the band filled with lids and such
>I would have agreed with you whole heartedly. But then I would ask why
>you think that CW proficiency is a good and valid filter for poor
>operators.

I've never argued that CW proficiency makes one a better person. Limiting
access to spectrum based on a willingness to learn to use a more spectrally
efficient manual modulation scheme, however, is clearly a fair deal.

--

-=Paul Flaherty, N9FZX | "Just name a hero, and I'll prove he's a bum."
->paulf@Stanford.EDU | -- Col. Gregory "Pappy" Boyington, USMC (ret)

Date: Wed, 12 May 1993 20:54:52 GMT
From: dog.ee.lbl.gov!overload.lbl.gov!agate!news.ucdavis.edu!othello.ucdavis.edu!
ez006683@network.UCSD.EDU
Subject: More on no-code
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

paulf@umunhum.stanford.edu (Paul Flaherty) writes:

: In article <C6vxDo.JJG@ucdavis.edu> ez006683@othello.ucdavis.edu (Daniel D.
Todd) writes:

: >: 1. Because, empirically, they don't. We already know that.

: > ^^^^^^^^^^^ and YOU are unbiased?

:
: I think that if you are of the opinion that the loads on the CW and Phone
: spectra in the amateur HF allocations are not comparable, not many would
: agree with you, including the FCC, which has the empirical studies to back up
: the opinion.

: >: 2. You're proposing the change, so it's *your* burden of proof.

: > Oh good now we're getting close! What would you like to see proven,
: >specifically? I have never, to the best of my knowledge said it would be
: >a good thing to completely eliminate code from licensing in the US.

:
: You need to demonstrate that any change that you do in fact propose will not
: increase band loading beyond capacity. That's what the current system

: has achieved.

Hmmm... I just can't seem to remember seeing that it is the FCC's job to *minimize* use of the amateur bands. Yes, when you say it keeps the bands from becoming overcrowded that does minimize the use. If you can point out where part 97 says that it is the FCC's job to prevent overcrowding the bands please post it. Does that mean they can limit the number of amateurs to say 600,000 that should keep the bands from getting anymore crowded. DO I also have to prove that my proposal, not that I've made any, won't cause an increase in cancer either ? Or how about TVI? Maybe it will harm/help ozone.

> I have pointed out how ridiculous many of your arguments are. :
: This is only your second posting in response to one of mine. I've posted
: dozens of times on this issue, over the past nine years. Would you mind
: being more specific as to which of my arguments are "ridiculous"?

Ridiculous argument #1:

If you want to discuss a topic you must PROVE that your idea will not cause increased band crowding.

That means that if I want to get more spectrum or allow another mode (SS) I have to prove that it won't overcrowd the bands. Or if I want to take the extra exam do I have to prove that I won't be the straw that breaks the camel's back and overflow the bands? (I realize that my taking the 4b exam won't require a change in rules but it will change band load)

Ridiculous argument #2:

The implied argument that the bands are not currently over crowded. They are overcrowded at certain times at not at other times. The same way it will be if the code requirement is dropped/relaxed. I have a radio that I turn on, sometimes I can find lots of empty spectrum and sometimes there isn't any empty room. The ratio

Ridiculous argument #3:

I'm empirical (perhaps should be imperial) and you're not. The FCC has these numbers. But Gee.. I'm not gonna say what they are. Just admit that it is an opinion or post the reference, UC Davis has a library and if it's not here I'll have them borrow it from Stanford.

That's just in this post.

But seriously I meant that the arguments that we need CW to keep out the riff raff, call for help when our airplane crashes etc. are ridiculous and I was using you in the plural.

: >To claim you want to keep the bands from becoming crowded you are only
: > showing that you wish to remain an elitist.
:
: Hmm, about a two on the JSMADS. ;-)

Since I haven't been on the 'net for nine years I have no idea what JSMADS means. I assume it was used to impress upon me that I know much less than you do and you are much better than me.

According to Webster (I won't give whole reference)
elitism 1) practice of or belief in rule by the elite. 2) pride in belonging to a select or favored group. elitist, n.

It must really kill you that I'm part of the same favored group as you.
Or that there are also extras who want to see the code requirement changed.

: Seriously, limiting the number of spectrum users is no more elitist than
: limiting the number of people in a theatre due to the fire hazard.

Please tell me how a large number of spectrum users is equivalent to an
overcrowded movie theatre. I think I'll move my fire extinguisher closer
to my '530. :-)

Please make that ridiculous argument #4

: >Had you said that you don't want to see the band filled with lids and such
: >I would have agreed with you whole heartedly. But then I would ask why
: >you think that CW proficiency is a good and valid filter for poor
: >operators.
:
: I've never argued that CW proficiency makes one a better person. Limiting
: access to spectrum based on a willingness to learn to use a more spectrally
: efficient manual modulation scheme, however, is clearly a fair deal.

Okay, at least I can get you to admit to that there is no correlation
between CW proficiency and operator quality! Why is CW proficiency a
better way to prove a willingness to learn than say... requiring a college
degree? That requires quite a bit more willingness to learn. Or how about
passing a basic, college level electronics course? At least an
electronics course will have some relevance to almost all hams. If they
can't afford the class why there is another, more arbitrary method to keep
the numbers down. Maybe income will fit your idea of a filter better.

Dan

--

```
*-----*
* Daniel D. Todd      Packet: KC6UUD@WA6RDH.#nocal.ca.usa      *
*                    Internet: DDTODD@ucdavis.edu              *
*                    Snail Mail: 1750 Hanover #102              *
*                    Davis CA 95616                             *
*-----*
*      I do not speak for the University of California....      *
*      and it sure as hell doesn't speak for me!!              *
```

Date: Wed, 12 May 1993 13:38:19 CET
From: dog.ee.lbl.gov!overload.lbl.gov!agate!howland.reston.ans.net!
newsserver.jvnc.net!gmd.de!dearn!esoc!wkoehler@network.UCSD.EDU
Subject: Should auto mechanics learn how to shoe horses?
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In article <1993May12.021920.107854@locus.com>, dana@spica.la.locus.com (Dana H. Myers) says:

>Once upon a time ...(stuff deleted) ... if you were in the communications
>business, you needed to know how send and receive CW with the available
>equipment at the time, which was the human hand and ear (and maybe a
>semi-auto key). If you didn't know CW, you were limited from a
>lot of business.

True for business, but again you're missing the point. I maintain the
opinion that amateur radio is a pastime, not a business, wouldn't you agree?
An I know the difference as I was in the business side of it.

73, Wolf.

DL3ZBJ, AB6EL, VK6BGV.

'There is nothing in the world
that gives such a zest to life
as the possession of a hobby,
and the power of indulging it.'

Jessie Couvreur ('Tasma')
1848 - 1897

Date: Wed, 12 May 93 18:05:41 GMT
From: swrinde!zaphod.mps.ohio-state.edu!howland.reston.ans.net!agate!
headwall.Stanford.EDU!nntp.Stanford.EDU!umunhum!paulf@network.UCSD.EDU
Subject: Should auto mechanics learn how to shoe horses?
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In article <1993May12.021920.107854@locus.com> dana@spica.la.locus.com (Dana H. Myers) writes:

>Now, CW has been replaced in commercial circuits by wire and fiber
>circuits, SITOR, voice modes, packet modes, satellite links, and
>a myriad of other automated services which provide greater throughput
>with less human effort.

What you say is true of both manual modes (SSB and CW), as well as HF.

Moreover, as both CW, SSB, and HF been around for more than 50 years, by your analogy, all are antequated. So, if you're so upset about having to learn about "antequated" technology, why not just stick with running ACSB or digital modes over satellites?

--

-=Paul Flaherty, N9FZX | "Just name a hero, and I'll prove he's a bum."
->paulf@Stanford.EDU | -- Col. Gregory "Pappy" Boyington, USMC (ret)

Date: Wed, 12 May 1993 16:46:46 GMT
From: agate!news.ucdavis.edu!othello.ucdavis.edu!ez006683@ames.arpa
Subject: Should auto mechanics learn how to shoe horses?
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

WKOEHLER@ESOC.BITNET (WOLF KOEHLER) writes:

: In article <1993May12.021920.107854@locus.com>, dana@spica.la.locus.com (Dana H. Myers) says:

: >Once upon a time ...(stuff deleted) ... if you were in the communications
: >business, you needed to know how send and receive CW with the available
: >equipment at the time, which was the human hand and ear (and maybe a
: >semi-auto key). If you didn't know CW, you were limited from a
: >lot of business.

:

: True for business, but again you're missing the point. I maintain the
: opinion that amateur radio is a pastime, not a business, wouldn't you agree?
: An I know the difference as I was in the business side of it.

:

I'll buy that, but in what way does that refute the arguement that CW is an antiquated mode. Or are you suggesting that hobbies should not progress with the business side of things? I hope you have another reason for pointing out that it is just a hobby than that. It wasn't too long ago that amateur radio was leading the way in development of SSB, EME etc. but now we should use antiquated means of communication just because we're a hobby? Since we are a hobby our communications don't need, for the most part, the kind of reliability required of commercial outfits and therefore we are, or should be, free to experiment with many different modes and equipment. While businesses require very reliable communications and should only use only the most reliable means of communication available.

I don't use the old fashioned rythm nethod of birth control either, and that is certainly a hobby. Well *I* don't do it professionally anyway.
:-) :-) :-) :-) :-) :-)

Dan

```

* Daniel D. Todd      Packet: KC6UUD@WA6RDH.#nocal.ca.usa      *
*                      Internet: DDTODD@ucdavis.edu            *
*                      Snail Mail: 1750 Hanover #102           *
*                      Davis CA 95616                         *
*-----*
*      I do not speak for the University of California....    *
*      and it sure as hell doesn't speak for me!!             *
*-----*

```

```

-----
Date: Wed, 12 May 1993 20:38:48 GMT
From: concert!gatech!howland.reston.ans.net!ux1.cso.uiuc.edu!news.cso.uiuc.edu!
ux4.cso.uiuc.edu!apeters2@decwrl.dec.com
Subject: Should auto mechanics learn how to shoe horses?
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

```

WOLF KOEHLER <WKOEHLER@ESOC.BITNET> writes:

```

>True for business, but again you're missing the point. I maintain the
>opinion that amateur radio is a pastime, not a business, wouldn't you agree?
>An I know the difference as I was in the business side of it.

```

you were involved in amateur radio as a business?
 doesn't that mean that you were breaking the law?
 I could have sworn that business practices were banned from amateur use...

n9oni
 avram peters
 apeters2@ux4.cso.uiuc.edu

```

-----
Date: Tue, 11 May 93 21:16:55 CDT
From: mvb.saic.com!unogate!news.service.uci.edu!usc!howland.reston.ans.net!
zaphod.mps.ohio-state.edu!menudo.uh.edu!jpunix!unkaphaed!amanda!
robert@network.UCSD.EDU
Subject: sick of it all
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

```

little@nuts2u.enet.dec.com (nuts2u::little) writes:

```

> robert@amanda.jpunix.com (robert) writes:
>
> >International Treaty (of which the United States is a signatory) requires
> >knowledge of the International Morse Code for operation below 30 MHz.
> >Again Todd, you should contact the FCC on this one. There is a procedure

```


> in >place for you, as a citizen, to change the rules. It is called called a
> >"Petition for Rulemaking" and is contained in the Code of Federal
> >Regulations, Title 47. This is available from your local GPO Bookstore,
> >library, or FCC Field Office.

>

> Thank you. I'm aware of the treaty and has been aptly pointed out before,
> an adminstration is free to waive the requirement by notifying the ITU in
> writing of their intention to do so. Also I'm aware of the process for
> Petition for Rulemaking and will probably submit such a petition. I'm
> trying to gauge the support and opposition to various possible petitions.
> It is clear that a small vocal minority will oppose any change that
> disrupts or detracts from their perceived self-importance. Thank you for
> you input. I can assure you I will consider your objections in whatever
> petition I put forth. :-)

>

> 73,
> Todd
> N9MWB

I think you're putting yourself in the place of the Commission at this point, for it is THEY who consider objections to petitions, and not you. Regardless, I doubt whether I will lodge any comment toward it, either pro or con. The majority of NPRMs never seem to go anywhere, anyway.

A small vocal minority that will oppose any change that disrupts or detracts from their perceived self-importance? Hummm...I think I know of the group you speak. They seem to always be the ones who file Petitions for Rulemaking.

Have a nice day.

--Robert WA3J

Date: 12 May 93 22:26:49 GMT
From: ddsww1!indep1!clifto@uunet.uu.net
Subject: sick of it all
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In article <1993May10.221340.23936@nnnnpd2.cxo.dec.com> little@nuts2u.enet.dec.com (nuts2u::little) writes:

:robert@amanda.jpunix.com (robert) writes:

:

:>International Treaty (of which the United States is a signatory) requires
:>knowledge of the International Morse Code for operation below 30 MHz.

:

:writing of their intention to do so. Also I'm aware of the process for

:Petition for Rulemaking and will probably submit such a petition. I'm

Probably a waste of time, Todd, since at the last WARC, the United States already strongly pushed the idea of removing the requirement from the treaty. Having been UNANIMOUSLY opposed on that, they've thought it best just to bide their time and wait until the next WARC to try again (and apocryphal rumors suggest that this time they'll be trying some political pressure).

--

```
+-----+
|  Cliff Sharp  |      clifto@indep1.chi.il.us   OR  clifto@indep1.uucp   |
|   WA9PDM     |                        Use whichever one works          |
+-----+
```

Date: 13 May 93 00:04:32 GMT
From: dog.ee.lbl.gov!overload.lbl.gov!agate!howland.reston.ans.net!
darwin.sura.net!sgiblab!bridge2!zen.DEV.3Com.COM!joer@network.UCSD.EDU
Subject: What we all agree on - THEORY TESTS THAT MEAN SOMETHING
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

ez006683@othello.ucdavis.edu (Daniel D. Todd) writes:

>Well.... now that you bring it up what if we kept the exam multiple
>choice but only publish the questions. People can study them and be sure
>they receive an appropriate exam and teh can't memorize 3A-14 is A. Or
>whatever. Of course the block diagrams can be fill in the blanks and let
>the examinees view their exams after grading ao they have some form of
>immediate responce if they don't like the grading on the fill in the
>blanks. As you said a with a general fill in the blanks format it would be too
>difficult to assure objectivity. It would be nice to have a certain
>amount of continuity in the code portion of the exam too. Some of the
>VE's locally are known to have really easy muli\tiple choice exams for the
>code protion and others are known for being hard. (Sunnyvale=easy and
>River City ARC=hard) As others have said the misdirecters on the tech
>part of the exam can be really obvious sometimes. I think the number
>answers that are just off by misplaced decimals are the most fair. They
>don't require all the tedious math but they do require one to know what
>range of values to expect.

>IMNSHO

>Dan

>--

```
>*-----*
>* Daniel D. Todd      Packet: KC6UUD@WA6RDH.#nocal.ca.usa      *
>*                      Internet: DDTODD@ucdavis.edu              *
>*                      Snail Mail: 1750 Hanover #102             *
```


are a special interest group. I think it is important to know SOMETHING about the different modes available in the hobby. I remember a thread about endorsements for different modes and frequencies. This would get out of hand and I feel we need to simplify not complicate the testing process. Simplify as in not so many different elements not *make it easier.*

Dan

```
*-----*
* Daniel D. Todd      Packet: KC6UUD@WA6RDH.#nocal.ca.usa      *
*                    Internet: DDTODD@ucdavis.edu              *
*                    Snail Mail: 1750 Hanover #102              *
*                    Davis CA 95616                            *
*-----*
*      I do not speak for the University of California....    *
*      and it sure as hell doesn't speak for me!!            *
*-----*
```

Date: 12 May 93 16:34:39 GMT
From: arizona.edu!violet.ccit.arizona.edu!lester@arizona.edu
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <QBE562E9@mmmpc6>, <C6Gu9B.K9L@murdoch.acc.Virginia.EDU>,
<2290@indep1.UUCP>hod.m
Subject : Re: sick of it all

In article <2290@indep1.UUCP>, clifto@indep1.UUCP (Cliff Sharp) writes:
> In article <C6Gu9B.K9L@murdoch.acc.Virginia.EDU> jeg7e@livia.acs.Virginia.EDU
(Jon Gefaell) writes:
>>In article <QBE562E9@mmmpc6> hlester@as.arizona.edu (Howard Lester) writes:
>>
>>>Is this what you want?
>>
>>Do you realize you sound like a fool?
>
> He certainly does. He doesn't allow for the fact that his proposed test

> Howard, you sound like a fool. Remove that highly discriminatory
> requirement from your proposed test, and you've got something everyone
> can live with.

Cliff, either I didn't get YOUR joke(?) or you (and others) didn't get mine.
My "proposed exam" was entirely tongue-in-cheek, aimed at those who would
propose to banish, or at least greatly reduce, the CW requirement from

amateur exams.

Howard

End of Ham-Policy Digest V93 #140
